



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,356	10/11/2001	Lawrence A. Rheins	DERM1100-6	2535

7590 09/24/2003

Lisa A. Haile, J.D., Ph.D.  
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP  
Suite 1600  
4365 Executive Drive  
San Diego, CA 92121-2189

EXAMINER

KAPUST, RACHEL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/976,356

Applicant(s)

RHEINS ET AL.

Examiner

Rachel B. Kapust

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6,7,8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification of in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on October 11, 2001, November 11, 2002, and April 11, 2003 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

### ***Drawings***

Figures 1 and 2 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they are not of sufficient quality to provide an understanding of the disclosed invention. Figure 1 is supposed to be an exposure of a gel representing the results for ribonuclease protection assays (RPA) using four different probes. Figure 2 is also an exposure of a gel representing the results of a RPA. However, the figures are unintelligible. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to

Art Unit: 1647

avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

The use of the trademarks RiboQuant™ and ImageQuant™ has been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garofano *et al.* (1996), *Adv. Forensic Haemogenet.* 6: 281-283, submitted by Applicants April 11, 2003.

Garofano *et al.* teach a method for obtaining skin cell samples comprising pressing tape against various skin areas (p. 281). DNA is then extracted from the sample by placing the tape in cell lysis buffer. Garofano *et al.* teach all of the components of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is anticipated by Garofano *et al.*

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garofano *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Paludan *et al.* (1992), *J. Invest. Derm.* 99: 830-835, submitted by Applicants April 11, 2003.

The rejected claims differ from the teachings of Garofano *et al.* in that they require an mRNA detection reagent. Paludan *et al.* disclose methods for isolation and analysis of mRNA from samples obtained by skin scraping. Furthermore, they state "Our technique has proved useful for discriminating between epidermal IL-8 mRNA levels in a variety of inflammatory skin

Art Unit: 1647

diseases and reactions, and should be applicable to analysis of other cytokine mRNAs and other skin compartments" (p. 834).

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method disclosed by Garofano *et al.* to detect mRNA as taught by Paludan *et al.* The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the substitution in view of the less invasive nature of Garofano *et al.*'s methods, and would have expected success, as Garofano *et al.* specifically disclose that nucleated cells were obtained (p. 282). The person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that nucleated cells would be expected to contain RNA, including mRNA, as detected by Paludan *et al.* Further, in view of Paludan *et al.*'s teachings, it would have been obvious to use the method of Garofano *et al.* to detect samples from individuals with inflammatory skin diseases and/or reactions. Accordingly, the invention, taken as a whole, is *prima facie* obvious over the prior art.

NO CLAIMS ARE ALLOWED.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel B. Kapust whose telephone number is (703) 305-0634. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on (703) 308-4623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/976,356

Page 6

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

RBK

9/22/03

  
JANET  
PATENT EXAMINER  
UNIT 1647